

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks Examiner for the detailed Office Action dated May 19, 2006. In response to the issues raised, the Applicant offers the following submissions.

35 U.S.C. §103 - Claims 1 to 5

Claims 1 to 5 stand rejected as obvious in light of US 6,364,451 to the present Applicant in view of US 2004/0207674 to Otsuki and US 2002/0140758 to Watrobski et al.

The Applicant disagrees. None of the cited references disclose a printer that is upgradable such that replace one cartridge for another provides an improved performance. Otsuki teaches a printer that can read information stored on the ink cartridges relating to the adjustment values for 'dot forming positions'. In essence, the printer calculates the time that a drop of ink should be ejected to account for lateral drift across the page caused by the scan velocity of the printhead. Obviously, this is a problem for bi-directionally scanning printheads. However, the information stored in the cartridges simply removes the print artifacts that occur if the printer did not account for variations in lateral drift of the ink drop. The print quality (or printer performance) is therefore maintained when a new cartridge is inserted – not improved.

The present invention is method of facilitating a printer upgrade so that the user can enhance the performance of a printer if the usage profile is no longer met by the initial printer configuration. None of the cited references suggest a printer that can be improved with the installation of an upgrading cartridge. Furthermore, Otsuki teaches away from being combined with the pagewidth printheads of Silverbrook and Watrobski. It is well established that there is no motivation to combine disclosures if one of the references would no longer meet its objectives if modified by the second reference. Otsuki seeks to accurately adjust the ejection timing for individual cartridges for unidirectional or bi-directional scanning printheads. Were the printheads pagewidth, there would be no lateral drift in the ejected drops because of the scan velocity and the Otsuki invention becomes moot.

In light of the above, the cited references fail to support a §103 rejection of claim 1. It follows that claims 2-5 are likewise non-obvious in view of the citations.

Appln No. 10/760,205
Amdt. Dated July 11, 2006
Response to Office Action of May 19, 2006

3

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection has been successfully traversed and the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762